

STOCHASTIC ORDERS AND THE FROG MODEL

TOBIAS JOHNSON AND MATTHEW JUNG

ABSTRACT. The *frog model* starts with one active particle at the root of a graph and some number of dormant particles at all nonroot vertices. Active particles follow independent random paths, waking all inactive particles they encounter. We prove that certain frog model statistics are monotone in the initial configuration for two nonstandard stochastic dominance relations: the increasing concave and the probability generating function orders.

This extends many canonical theorems. We connect recurrence for random initial configurations to recurrence for deterministic configurations. Also, the limiting shape of activated sites on the integer lattice respects both of these orders. Other implications include monotonicity results on transience of the frog model with a decaying Bernoulli-distributed number of frogs per vertex, on survival of the frog model with death, and on the time to visit a given vertex in any frog model.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a countable collection of vertices, one of which we distinguish as the root and call \emptyset . A general frog model (η, S) starts with one active particle at \emptyset and $\eta(v)$ dormant particles at each $v \neq \emptyset$. The i th particle at v starting from its time of activation moves according to the path $S_\bullet(v, i)$, with $S_0(v, i)$ assumed equal to v . When an active particle visits a site containing dormant particles, *all* of the dormant particles activate. The particles move in discrete time, though this will be unimportant since most of the properties of the frog model we consider depend only on the particles' paths and not on the time they make their moves. The particles are traditionally called frogs, and we continue the zoomorphism. Typically, G is a graph, the frog paths $(S_\bullet(v, i))_{v \in G, i \geq 1}$ are independent random walks, the frog counts $(\eta(v))_{v \in G}$ are either deterministic or i.i.d., and $(S_\bullet(v, i))_{v \in G, i \geq 1}$ and $(\eta(v))_{v \in G}$ are independent of each other. We will not belabor an example like the frog model with simple random walk paths on \mathbb{Z}^d and i.i.d.- $\text{Poi}(\mu)$ frogs per vertex by stating that the frog paths are mutually independent, and that the frog counts and paths are independent.

Our main result is about two classes of frog model functionals we call *icv* and *pgf statistics*. The prime example is the number of visits to \emptyset in the frog model (η, S) over all time, which we denote $r(\eta, S)$. A realization of the frog model is called *recurrent* if $r(\eta, S) = \infty$ and *transient* otherwise. In [TW99], the frog model with one sleeping frog per site and simple random walk paths is shown to be recurrent on \mathbb{Z}^d for all d . This is further refined in [Pop01], which exhibits a threshold in α at which a frog model with Bernoulli($\alpha\|x\|^{-2}$) frogs at each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ switches from transience to recurrence. A similar phenomenon occurs when the walks have a bias in one direction: [GS09] finds that on \mathbb{Z} , the model is recurrent if and

Date: July 25, 2016.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60K35, 60J80, 60J10.

Key words and phrases. Frog model, transience, recurrence, phase transition, stochastic orders, increasing concave order, probability generating function order.

The first author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1401479.

only if the number of sleeping frogs per site has infinite logarithmic moment. A sufficient condition for recurrence in this setting on \mathbb{Z}^d was given in [DP14] and improved on in [KZ16]. In our papers [HJJ16b, HJJ16a, JJ16], we prove that the frog model with simple random walk paths on a d -ary tree switches from transient to recurrent either when the density of frogs increases with d held fixed, or when d decreases with the density held fixed.

Statement of main theorem. Our main result is a comparison theorem relating icv and pgf statistics of a frog model (see Definition 14) when we vary the distribution of the initial configuration η . Our original motivation was that while the most convenient setting has Poisson-distributed frog counts, the most basic questions assume a deterministic number of frogs per site. As an example, in [HJJ16a] we showed the existence of a recurrence phase on the d -ary tree with Poisson frogs per site for any $d \geq 2$. This left open the existence of a recurrence phase for initial conditions other than i.i.d. Poisson. For instance, for large enough k , is the frog model recurrent on the d -ary tree with k frogs per site? With our previous tools, we could answer this question only for the case $d = 2$ [HJJ16b], but our comparison theorem tidily transfers the result from Poisson to deterministic initial conditions (see Corollary 4).

If $\eta(v)$ is dominated by $\eta'(v)$ in the usual stochastic order, then we can couple the corresponding frog models and deduce that $f(\eta, S)$ is dominated by $f(\eta', S)$ for any statistic f that is increasing in η . This is not helpful for the problem described above, since we cannot relate a Poisson random variable to the constant k in this stochastic order. We instead turn to weaker stochastic dominance relations known as the *increasing concave order* and the *probability generating function order*. We abbreviate these as *icv order* and *pgf order*, respectively, and we denote the relations by \preceq_{icv} and \preceq_{pgf} . The icv order has come up several times in discrete probability, most notably in first passage percolation [vdBK93, Mar02]. See also [Zer98] for an application to random walk in a random environment. In these papers, the relation $\pi_1 \preceq_{\text{icv}} \pi_2$ is referred to as π_2 being *more variable* than π_1 . The only use of the pgf order that we know of in discrete probability is our own in [HJJ16b], though see [TRZ11, LT14] for some applications in signal processing and wireless networks under the name *Laplace transform order*.

Our main theorem applies to functions of the frog model including the count $r(\eta, S)$ of visits to the root and the total number of activated sites up to a given time. Our result is that such statistics are monotonic in the initial frog configuration with respect to these weaker stochastic orders.

Theorem 1. *Assume that the frog paths $S_\bullet(v, i)$ and counts $\eta(v)$ and $\eta'(v)$ are mutually independent for all v and i , and that the paths $S_\bullet(v, i)$ at a particular vertex v are identically distributed for all i .*

- (a) *If f is a continuous icv statistic in the sense of Definition 14 and $\eta(v) \preceq_{\text{icv}} \eta'(v)$ for all v , then $f(\eta, S) \preceq_{\text{icv}} f(\eta', S)$.*
- (b) *If f is a continuous pgf statistic in the sense of Definition 14 and $\eta(v) \preceq_{\text{pgf}} \eta'(v)$ for all v , then $f(\eta, S) \preceq_{\text{pgf}} f(\eta', S)$.*

The intuition behind the proof is that the extra frogs woken by the addition of two frogs at some vertex is the union of the frogs woken by the addition of each frog separately. This subadditivity property meshes neatly with concavity—for instance, the expected number of visits to the root will increase concavely as frogs are added at a vertex—and somehow this makes the frog model interact well with stochastic orders defined in terms of concave functions.

Applications. As we mentioned, our main statistic of interest fits the criteria of Theorem 1.

Proposition 2. *The count $r(\eta, S)$ of visits to \emptyset in the frog model (η, S) is a continuous icv and pgf statistic of the frog model.*

This allows us to transfer many recurrence and transience results to different initial conditions. In the increasing concave order, the constant k dominates all mean k random variables. Theorem 1(a) and Proposition 2 therefore imply the following:

Corollary 3. *Consider the frog model on a graph with mutually independent frog paths and i.i.d. frogs per site with common mean μ . If this is almost surely recurrent, then for any integer $k \geq \mu$, the same frog model with k frogs per site is almost surely recurrent.*

This solves our problem of showing that the frog model on a d -ary tree with deterministically k frogs per site is recurrent for large enough k . In more detail, [HJJ16a, Theorem 1] establishes that on the d -ary tree with i.i.d.- $\text{Poi}(\mu)$ frogs per site, there is a critical value $\mu_c(d)$ such that the frog model is recurrent a.s. if $\mu > \mu_c(d)$ and transient a.s. if $\mu < \mu_c(d)$. Corollary 3, together with the estimates on $\mu_c(d)$ from [JJ16], give us the following result:

Corollary 4. *For any $d \geq 2$, the frog model on \mathbb{T}_d with k frogs per site is almost surely recurrent for large enough k . For large enough d , the model is almost surely transient if $k < .24d$ and almost surely recurrent if $k > 2.28d$.*

Another application of Theorem 1 concerns the transience regime of the d -ary tree. In [HJJ16b, Theorem 1] we show that on \mathbb{T}_d with one frog per site and simple random walk paths, the frog model is transient for $d \geq 5$. An immediate corollary of Theorem 1 is transience for all other mean 1 configurations.

Corollary 5. *For $d \geq 5$, the frog model on \mathbb{T}_d with $\eta(v)$ frogs at each site and $\mathbf{E}\eta(v) \leq 1$ for all $v \in \mathbb{T}_d$ is almost surely transient.*

Our next application is to the frog model on \mathbb{Z}^d . As mentioned earlier, [Pop01, Theorem 1.1] establishes the existence of a critical parameter $0 < \alpha_c(d) < \infty$ for the frog model with simple random walk paths on \mathbb{Z}^d and initial configuration given by $\eta(x) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_x)$ such that

- (i) if $p_x \leq \alpha/\|x\|^2$ for $\alpha < \alpha_c(d)$ and all sufficiently large x , then the model is transient with positive probability;
- (ii) if $p_x \geq \alpha/\|x\|^2$ for $\alpha > \alpha_c(d)$ and all sufficiently large x , then the model is transient with probability zero.

Theorem 1 allows us to extend part (i) of this result to non-Bernoulli distributions of sleeping frogs. Other results like [Pop01, Theorem 1.3] can be similarly extended.

Corollary 6. *For all $\alpha < \alpha_c(d)$ and any $(\eta(x), x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\})$ satisfying $\mathbf{E}\eta(x) \leq \alpha/\|x\|^2$ for sufficiently large x , the frog model on \mathbb{Z}^d with simple random walk paths and initial configuration η is transient with positive probability.*

A fundamental result for the frog model on \mathbb{Z}^d is that ξ_n , the set of squares containing activated vertices at time n , has a limiting shape. This was independently established for the discrete and continuous time one frog per site model in [AMP02a] and [RS04], respectively. When the number of frogs per site is independent and identically distributed as η , the result is still true. [AMPR01, Theorem 1.1] establishes that for any dimension $d \geq 1$ there is a

nonempty convex set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, which depends on the distribution of η , such that for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$(1 - \epsilon)\mathcal{A} \subseteq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_n}{n} \subseteq (1 + \epsilon)\mathcal{A}.$$

We deduce that the limiting shape, \mathcal{A} , respects the icv and pgf orders. This mirrors the inequalities for the time constant for first passage percolation that are proven in [vdBK93].

Corollary 7. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' be the limiting shapes for a frog model on \mathbb{Z}^d with i.i.d. η and η' particles at each site, respectively. If either $\eta \preceq_{\text{icv}} \eta'$ or $\eta \preceq_{\text{pgf}} \eta'$, then $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}'$.*

We also find applications to the frog model with death, explored in [AMP02b, FMS04, LMP05], where frogs have an independent chance $1 - p$ of dying at each step. This is a frog model according to our general definition, taking the frog paths to be stopped random walks. In this setting, the statistic of interest has been the total number of sites visited, which undergoes a phase transition on the regular tree from being finite a.s. to being infinite with positive probability as p grows. The model is said to *die out* in the first case and to *survive* in the second. The number of sites visited is an icv and pgf statistic, as we show in Proposition 20, and we therefore obtain the following result.

Corollary 8. *Let $\eta'(v) \succeq_{\text{icv}} \eta(v)$ be independent random variables indexed by the vertices v of an arbitrary graph G . If the frog model with death on G survives with $\eta(v)$ frogs at each v , then it survives with $\eta'(v)$ frogs at each v .*

All of the applications so far follow from either of parts (a) and (b) of Theorem 1, monotonicity in the icv and pgf orders, respectively. As (b) is the more difficult to prove, one might wonder why we bother with it. Our interest stems from the role of the pgf order in [HJJ16b] in proving recurrence for the frog model on the binary tree with one frog per site. Our argument there works by showing that the number of visits to the root is stochastically larger than any Poisson distribution in the pgf order. This hinges on [HJJ16b, Lemma 10], which shows that a certain operator is monotone with respect to the pgf order. The proof there is an unsatisfying calculation that cannot easily be extended to a general d -ary tree. But as we explain in Remark 21, this lemma and its analogues for $d \geq 3$ are now immediate corollaries of Theorem 1(b). We hope this will be helpful in other problems such as establishing recurrence for the frog model on a 3-ary tree.

Questions. We will give a few open problems on the theme of comparison theorems. A wider range of problems on the frog model are listed in [HJJ16b, HJJ16a].

We are interested in how sensitive the recurrence of the frog model is to the distribution of the frog counts. We believe that recurrence depends not just on the mean number of frogs at each vertex, but on the entire distribution.

Open Question 9. *Give an example where $r(\eta, S) = \infty$ a.s. and $r(\eta', S) < \infty$ a.s. with $\mathbf{E}\eta(v) = \mathbf{E}\eta'(v)$ for all v .*

Specifically, we would like to know that with simple random walk paths on the binary tree and i.i.d.- π frogs per vertex with mean 1, the frog model is transient when π is sufficiently unconcentrated.

Another question of ours is on a stronger version of Corollary 7. In [vdBK93], van den Berg and Kesten prove that in first passage percolation, strictly decreasing the passage time distribution in the icv order yields a strictly smaller time constant (and hence a strictly smaller limiting shape). Most of their work is in establishing the strictness.

Open Question 10. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' be the limiting shapes for a frog model on \mathbb{Z}^d with i.i.d.- ν and i.i.d.- ν' initial sleeping frogs per site, respectively. Under what conditions does it hold that $\nu \preceq_{\text{icv}} \nu'$ implies $\mathcal{A} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}'$?*

This cannot hold in full generality, because all choices of ν with sufficiently heavy tails have the same limiting shape, the L^1 -ball in \mathbb{R}^d [AMPR01, Theorem 1.2]. But it might hold under the assumption that ν and ν' have finite expectations, for example. It might also hold in full generality for the continuous-time frog model, but in this setting the shape theorem has only been proven for one per site initial conditions.

Finally, we are interested in comparing frog models when the graph is altered rather than the initial configuration. As a concrete question in this vein, we ask if the d -regular tree is the most transient graph in the following sense:

Open Question 11. *Suppose the frog model is transient on a d -regular graph G with simple random walks. Is it necessarily transient on an infinite d -regular tree with simple random walk paths and the same initial conditions?*

Acknowledgments. We thank Chris Hoffman for his general assistance, and we thank Jonathan Hermon for a discussion in 2014 that mentioned Open Question 11.

2. BACKGROUND MATERIAL ON STOCHASTIC ORDERS

Let π_1 and π_2 be probability measures on the extended nonnegative real numbers $[0, \infty]$, and let $X \sim \pi_1$ and $Y \sim \pi_2$. The following three stochastic orders will play a role in this paper:

Standard stochastic order: $\pi_1 \preceq_{\text{st}} \pi_2$ if $\mathbf{E}f(X) \leq \mathbf{E}f(Y)$ for all bounded increasing functions $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $f(\infty)$ taken as $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)$.

Increasing concave order: $\pi_1 \preceq_{\text{icv}} \pi_2$ if $\mathbf{E}f(X) \leq \mathbf{E}f(Y)$ for all bounded increasing concave functions $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $f(\infty)$ taken as $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)$.

Probability generating function order: $\pi_1 \preceq_{\text{pgf}} \pi_2$ if $\mathbf{E}t^X \geq \mathbf{E}t^Y$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$, with t^∞ interpreted as 0.

We use $X \preceq_{\text{st}} Y$, $X \preceq_{\text{st}} \pi_2$, and $\pi_1 \preceq_{\text{st}} Y$ all to mean that $\pi_1 \preceq_{\text{st}} \pi_2$, and we do the same with the other two orders.

We have listed these three stochastic orders in decreasing strength. That is,

$$(1) \quad \pi_1 \preceq_{\text{st}} \pi_2 \implies \pi_1 \preceq_{\text{icv}} \pi_2 \implies \pi_1 \preceq_{\text{pgf}} \pi_2.$$

The first implication is obvious. For the second, the map $x \mapsto 1 - t^x$ is an increasing concave function for any $t \in (0, 1)$, establishing that $\mathbf{E}t^X \geq \mathbf{E}t^Y$ for $t \in (0, 1)$ if $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$.

See [SS07] for a reference on stochastic dominance. We have made two slight changes from the usual definitions found there. First, in the standard and icv orders, we have required our test functions to be bounded. This apparently weaker definition is in fact equivalent to the usual one, as seen by approximating an unbounded increasing or increasing concave function by a sequence of bounded ones. Second, we have allowed our probability measures to take the value ∞ with positive probability. All of the standard results on stochastic orderings are unaffected by this change. It is worth noting that if $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$, then $\mathbf{P}[X = \infty] \leq \mathbf{P}[Y = \infty]$. To see this, note that as $t \nearrow 1$, we have $t^x \rightarrow \mathbf{1}\{x < \infty\}$. Thus, by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\mathbf{E}t^X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}[X < \infty] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}t^Y \rightarrow \mathbf{P}[Y < \infty]$$

as $t \nearrow 1$. Now $\mathbf{E}t^X \geq \mathbf{E}t^Y$ for $t \in (0, 1)$ implies that $\mathbf{P}[X < \infty] \geq \mathbf{P}[Y < \infty]$. By (1), the conclusion also holds under the assumption $X \preceq_{\text{st}} Y$ or $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$. We also mention that a similar argument with a limit as $t \searrow 0$ shows that if $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$, then $\mathbf{P}[X = 0] \geq \mathbf{P}[Y = 0]$.

Roughly speaking, the standard order rewards distributions for being large, while the icv order rewards them either for being large or for being concentrated. The characterizations of these two orders in terms of couplings make this more precise: $X \preceq_{\text{st}} Y$ if and only if X and Y can be coupled so that $X \leq Y$ a.s. [SS07, Theorem 1.A.1], and $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$ if and only if X and Y can be coupled so that $\mathbf{E}[X | Y] \leq Y$ a.s. [SS07, Theorem 4.A.5]. Another useful equivalent condition for $\pi_1 \preceq_{\text{st}} \pi_2$ is that $\mathbf{P}[X > t] \leq \mathbf{P}[Y > t]$ for all t .

A function φ is called *completely monotone* if

$$(-1)^n \frac{d}{dx} \varphi(x) \geq 0$$

for all $n \geq 0$ and x in the domain of the function. Using Bernstein's characterization of the completely monotone functions as mixtures of functions of the form e^{-ux} , [SS07, Theorem 5.A.3] characterizes $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$ as holding if and only if $\mathbf{E}\varphi(X) \geq \mathbf{E}\varphi(Y)$ for all completely monotone functions φ on $[0, \infty)$. Probabilistically, the pgf order seems more difficult to interpret. In particular, we are not aware of any characterization of it in terms of couplings. One probabilistic interpretation if X and Y are integer-valued is that $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$ if and only if the p -thinning of X is more likely than the p -thinning of Y to be zero, for any $p \in [0, 1]$. The advantage of the pgf order in our experience is that one can test it by explicit calculations, as we did in our proof of recurrence of the one-per-site frog model on the binary tree in [HJJ16b].

For the most part, we will be comparing random variables taking values in the nonnegative integers. The next proposition lets us use test functions for icv and pgf dominance defined on this space rather than on all of $[0, \infty)$. For a function f on the integers, we define the difference operator

$$(2) \quad Df(k) = f(k+1) - f(k).$$

We call this D rather than the more common Δ to avoid ambiguity with a related operator we define in Section 3. Repeated application of D yields the following expression (see [Sta12, eq. (1.97)]):

$$(3) \quad D^n f(k) = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^{n-i} \binom{n}{i} f(k+i).$$

Proposition 12. *Let X and Y take values on the extended nonnegative integers. In the following statements, we assume that $\varphi(k)$ is a bounded function on the nonnegative integers with a limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and we interpret $\varphi(\infty)$ as this limit.*

- (a) *It holds that $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$ if and only if $\mathbf{E}\varphi(X) \leq \mathbf{E}\varphi(Y)$ for functions φ as above that satisfy $D\varphi(k) \geq 0$ and $D^2\varphi(k) \leq 0$ for all k .*
- (b) *It holds that $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$ if and only if $\mathbf{E}\varphi(X) \leq \mathbf{E}\varphi(Y)$ for functions φ as above that satisfy $(-1)^n D^n \varphi(k) \leq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. If $\varphi(x)$ is increasing and concave on $[0, \infty)$, then it is easily seen that $D\varphi(k) \geq 0$ and $D^2\varphi(k) \leq 0$ for all k . Similarly, one can easily check that if $\varphi(x) = 1 - p^x$, then $(-1)^n D^n \varphi(k) \leq 0$ for all k . This proves the criteria stated in (a) and (b) imply icv and pgf dominance, respectively.

For the other direction in (a), suppose that $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$. Let φ be a test function defined on the nonnegative integers satisfying $D\varphi(k) \geq 0$ and $D^2\varphi(k) \leq 0$ for all k . This can

be extended to an increasing concave function on $[0, \infty)$ by linearly interpolating between integer points, for example, and hence $\mathbf{E}\varphi(X) \leq \mathbf{E}\varphi(Y)$ by the assumption that $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$.

For (b), suppose that $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$, and let φ be a bounded test function on the nonnegative integers satisfying $(-1)^n \Delta^n \varphi(k) \leq 0$ for all k . We now appeal to a classic result of Hausdorff's stating that a sequence $f(0), f(1), \dots$ can be represented as a moment sequence

$$f(k) = \int_{[0,1]} u^k \sigma(du)$$

for some positive measure σ if and only if

$$(-1)^n \Delta^n f(k) \geq 0$$

for all $n \geq 0$. (See [Akh65, Theorem 2.6.4], but note that Δ^n as defined there is equal to $(-1)^n$ times our Δ^n .) Let C be an upper bound on φ , and apply Hausdorff's result to $C - \varphi(k)$ to obtain the representation

$$C - \varphi(k) = \int_{[0,1]} u^k \sigma(du)$$

for some measure σ . Defining

$$\psi(x) = \int_{[0,1]} u^x \sigma(du),$$

for $x > 0$ and extending the function continuously to $x = 0$, we obtain a totally monotone function ψ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(k) &= C - \varphi(k), \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}, \\ \psi(0) &= \int_{(0,1]} \sigma(du) \leq C - \varphi(0). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\varphi(X) &= C - \mathbf{E}\psi(X) - \mathbf{P}[X = 0](C - \psi(0) - \varphi(0)), \\ \mathbf{E}\varphi(Y) &= C - \mathbf{E}\psi(Y) - \mathbf{P}[Y = 0](C - \psi(0) - \varphi(0)). \end{aligned}$$

Since ψ is totally monotone and $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$, we have $\mathbf{E}\psi(X) \geq \mathbf{E}\psi(Y)$. The relation $X \preceq_{\text{pgf}} Y$ implies that $\mathbf{P}[X = 0] \geq \mathbf{P}[Y = 0]$, and together with $C - \psi(0) - \varphi(0) \geq 0$, this implies that $\mathbf{E}\varphi(X) \leq \mathbf{E}\varphi(Y)$. \square

The following proposition shows that the maximal real- and integer-valued distributions in the icv order with a given expectation are the distributions that are as concentrated as possible.

Proposition 13.

- (a) If $\mathbf{E}X \leq c$, then $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} c$.
- (b) Suppose X takes nonnegative integer values and $\mathbf{E}X \in [k, k+1]$ for an integer k . Let Y be a random variable taking values in $\{k, k+1\}$ and satisfying $\mathbf{E}X \leq \mathbf{E}Y$. Then $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$.

Proof. Part (a) follows immediately from Jensen's inequality. For part (b), let φ be an arbitrary increasing concave function on $[0, \infty)$. To simplify the algebra, let $U = X - k$, $V = Y - k$, and $\psi(x) = \varphi(x + k) - \varphi(k)$. With these replacements, our goal is to show that $\mathbf{E}\psi(U) \leq \mathbf{E}\psi(V)$. We know that $\mathbf{E}U \in [0, 1]$ and that V is Bernoulli, and we know that ψ is increasing and concave on $[-k, \infty)$ and satisfies $\psi(0) = 0$.

Since V is Bernoulli with mean at least $\mathbf{E}U$,

$$(4) \quad \mathbf{E}\psi(V) \geq (\mathbf{E}U)\psi(1).$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \mathbf{E}[U \mid U \leq 0], & p &= \mathbf{P}[U \leq 0], \\ b &= \mathbf{E}[U \mid U \geq 1], & q &= 1 - p = \mathbf{P}[U \geq 1]. \end{aligned}$$

If $p = 0$ or $q = 0$, then U is deterministic and the result is trivial because U and V have the same distribution. Thus we can assume that both conditional expectations above are well defined.

Applying Jensen's inequality,

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{E}\psi(U) = p\mathbf{E}[\psi(U) \mid U \leq 0] + q\mathbf{E}[\psi(U) \mid U \geq 1] \leq p\psi(a) + q\psi(b).$$

As $a \leq 0$ and $b \geq 1$, the points $(a, \psi(a))$ and $(b, \psi(b))$ lie under the secant line connecting $(0, 0)$ and $(1, \psi(1))$ by the concavity of ψ . Thus $\psi(a) \leq a\psi(1)$ and $\psi(b) \leq b\psi(1)$. Applying to this to (5) and combining with (4) gives

$$\mathbf{E}\psi(U) \leq (pa + qb)\psi(1) = (\mathbf{E}U)\psi(1) \leq \mathbf{E}\psi(V). \quad \square$$

3. PROOF OF THE COMPARISON THEOREM

We now define the classes of statistics covered by our main theorems. Roughly speaking, we call a function of the frog model an *icv statistic* if it increases when a frog is added to the model, but when two frogs are added at the same vertex it increases less than by the separate addition of each of them. The *pgf statistics* form a more restrictive class of frog model functionals that obey a higher order version of this property. Many natural counts in the frog model will fall into these classes, as we will prove in Section 4.

Before we give the definitions, we will need to introduce some notation. Let

$$\{\eta(v), S_\bullet(v, i) : v \in G, i \geq 1\}$$

be a deterministic collection of frog counts and paths. For any path P_\bullet , let $\sigma_{P_\bullet}(\eta, S)$ denote a new frog model with an extra frog of path P_\bullet added at P_0 . That is, $\sigma_{P_\bullet}(\eta, S) = (\eta', S')$, where η' is identical to η except that $\eta'(P_0) = \eta(P_0) + 1$, and S' is identical to S except that $S'_\bullet(P_0, \eta(P_0) + 1) = P_\bullet$. For any frog model statistic $f(\eta, S)$, define

$$\Delta_{P_\bullet} f(\eta, S) = f(\sigma_{P_\bullet}(\eta, S)) - f(\eta, S),$$

the change in f when a frog with path P_\bullet is added to the model. As with the related operator D defined in (2), the operator can be applied repeatedly and expanded in the following way, which resembles (3). Let $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^n$ be frog paths, and let $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_j\} \subseteq [n]$, where we use the notation $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Define

$$(6) \quad \sigma_U(\eta, S) = \sigma_{P_\bullet^{u_1}} \cdots \sigma_{P_\bullet^{u_j}}(\eta, S),$$

the frog model (η, S) with the addition of frogs $P_\bullet^{u_1}, \dots, P_\bullet^{u_j}$. If U is empty, take $\sigma_U(\eta, S) = (\eta, S)$. Using this notation,

$$(7) \quad \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} f(\eta, S) = \sum_{U \subseteq [n]} (-1)^{n-|U|} f(\sigma_U(\eta, S)).$$

This can be proven by the same argument used in [Sta12, eq. (1.97)].

Definition 14. Let f be a functional of the frog model taking values in the nonnegative extended real numbers. We call f a *pgf statistic* if for any (η, S) and any paths $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^m$ starting at the same vertex for any $m \geq 1$,

$$(8) \quad (-1)^m \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^m} f(\eta, S) \leq 0.$$

If (8) holds for any (η, S) and any paths $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^m$ starting at the same vertex for $m = 1, 2$, then we call f an *icv statistic*. In either case, we call the statistic *continuous* if the condition

$$\eta_k(v) \nearrow \eta(v) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty \text{ for all } v \in G$$

implies that $f(\eta_k, S) \nearrow f(\eta, S)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

The $m = 1$ case of (8) is the condition that f increases when a new frog is added. To make the $m = 2$ case more transparent, we can expand condition (8) as

$$f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^1} \sigma_{P_\bullet^2}(\eta, S)) - f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^1}(\eta, S)) - f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^2}(\eta, S)) + f(\eta, S) \leq 0.$$

Shifting terms around, we have the equivalent condition

$$f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^1} \sigma_{P_\bullet^2}(\eta, S)) - f(\eta, S) \leq \left(f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^1}(\eta, S)) - f(\eta, S) \right) + \left(f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^2}(\eta, S)) - f(\eta, S) \right),$$

which states that the gain to the statistic by adding two frogs at the same vertex is less than the combined gain of adding each frog separately, as we mentioned earlier.

Lemma 15. Let $\varphi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be bounded, and interpret $\varphi(\infty)$ as $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x)$.

- (a) Suppose that φ is increasing and concave. If f is an icv statistic, then $\varphi \circ f$ is also an icv statistic.
- (b) Suppose that φ has completely monotone derivative; that is, it satisfies

$$(-1)^n \frac{d^n}{dx} \varphi(x) \leq 0$$

for all $n \geq 1$. If f is a pgf statistic, then $\varphi \circ f$ is also a pgf statistic.

Proof of part (a). We generalize the difference operator D given in (2) by defining

$$(9) \quad D_a h(x) = h(x + a) - h(x).$$

Now, we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{P_\bullet}(\varphi \circ f)(\eta, S) &= \varphi(f(\sigma_{P_\bullet}(\eta, S))) - \varphi(f(\eta, S)) \\ &= \varphi(f(\eta, S) + \Delta_{P_\bullet} f(\eta, S)) - \varphi(f(\eta, S)) \\ &= D_{\Delta_{P_\bullet} f(\eta, S)} \varphi(f(\eta, S)). \end{aligned}$$

By our assumption that f is an icv statistic, $\Delta_{P_\bullet} f(\eta, S) \geq 0$. Since φ is increasing, the whole expression is nonnegative, giving us $\Delta_{P_\bullet}(\varphi \circ f)(\eta, S) \geq 0$.

Next, we evaluate the second difference operator. To reduce clutter in the following expressions, we will abbreviate $f(\eta, S)$ as f .

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{P_1} \Delta_{P_2} (\varphi \circ f)(\eta, S) &= \varphi(f(\sigma_{P_1} \sigma_{P_2}(\eta, S))) - \varphi(f(\sigma_{P_1}(\eta, S))) \\
&\quad - \varphi(f(\sigma_{P_2}(\eta, S))) + \varphi(f(\eta, S)) \\
&= \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_1} f + \Delta_{P_2} f + \Delta_{P_1} \Delta_{P_2} f) \\
&\quad - \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_1} f) - \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_2} f) + \varphi(f) \\
&= D_{\Delta_{P_1} \Delta_{P_2} f} \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_1} f + \Delta_{P_2} f) + \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_1} f + \Delta_{P_2} f) \\
&\quad - \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_1} f) - \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_2} f) + \varphi(f) \\
&= D_{\Delta_{P_1} \Delta_{P_2} f} \varphi(f + \Delta_{P_1} f + \Delta_{P_2} f) + D_{\Delta_{P_1} f} D_{\Delta_{P_2} f} \varphi(f).
\end{aligned}$$

The first term here is nonpositive, since $\Delta_{P_1} \Delta_{P_2} f \leq 0$ and φ is increasing. The second term is nonpositive by the concavity of φ . This demonstrates that $\Delta_{P_1} \Delta_{P_2} (\varphi \circ f)(\eta, S) \leq 0$, completing the proof. \square

Proof of part (b). One might try to generalize the sorts of arguments used in the proof of part (a) to higher difference operators, which amounts to proving a discrete Faà di Bruno formula, the identity giving the higher derivatives of a composition. This is harder than one might expect. (The distrusting reader is encouraged to work out the $n = 3$ and $n = 4$ cases by hand to see how complicated it gets.) Instead, we will convert the difference operators to true derivatives and apply the Faà di Bruno formula itself.

Fix (η, S) and frog paths P_1^1, \dots, P_n^1 starting at the same vertex. For $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$, let $U_x = \{i \in [n] : x_i = 1\}$, and define

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(\sigma_{U_x}(\eta, S)),$$

recalling the notation given in (6). Let

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n} g(t_1, \dots, t_n) \prod_{i=1}^n ((1 - x_i) \mathbf{1}_{t_i=0} + x_i \mathbf{1}_{t_i=1}),$$

which is the unique multilinear polynomial on x_1, \dots, x_n that matches g when evaluated on $\{0, 1\}^n$. Let ∂_i denote the partial derivative with respect to x_i . For $B = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subseteq [n]$, let $\partial_B = \partial_{i_1} \cdots \partial_{i_k}$.

Claim. For any $x_1, \dots, x_n \in [0, 1]$ and any nonempty $B \subseteq [n]$,

$$(-1)^{|B|} \partial_B p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 0.$$

Proof. Let m and M be the minimum and maximum of a multilinear polynomial $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ on $[0, 1]^n$. Then f attains the values m and M on $\{0, 1\}^n$. To see this, observe that $\partial_i f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ does not depend on x_i . The function $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is therefore monotone in x_i with the other coordinates held fixed. Thus, if f achieves its maximum at (x_1, \dots, x_n) , it must also achieve it either at $(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ or $(1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, and then repeating the argument it must also achieve it with x_2 set to 0 or 1, and so on. The identical argument applies to the minimum.

Define the Δ_i operator on functions $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Delta_i h(x_1, \dots, x_n) = h(x_1, \dots, x_i + 1, \dots, x_n) - h(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

As we mentioned, $\partial_i p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ does not depend on x_i . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_i p(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \int_0^1 \partial_i p(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, h, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) dh \\ &= \Delta_i p(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 0, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n).\end{aligned}$$

Let $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\} \subseteq [n]$. Observing that ∂_i and Δ_j commute,

$$\partial_B p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Delta_{b_1} \cdots \Delta_{b_k} p(x_1 \mathbf{1}\{1 \notin B\}, \dots, x_n \mathbf{1}\{n \notin B\}).$$

Now, suppose $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$, and let $U = \{i: x_i = 1\}$. Then

$$\partial_B p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Delta_{P_{\bullet}^{b_1}} \cdots \Delta_{P_{\bullet}^{b_k}} f(\sigma_{U \setminus B}(\eta, S)).$$

Since f is a pgf statistic, we have

$$(10) \quad (-1)^{|B|} \partial_B p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 0$$

for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$. As derivatives of multilinear polynomials are multilinear, the extrema of $\partial_B p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ on $[0, 1]^n$ are obtained on $\{0, 1\}^n$, and hence (10) holds for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in [0, 1]$. \square

By the multivariate Faà di Bruno formula (see [Har06, Proposition 1] for a reference),

$$(11) \quad \partial_1 \cdots \partial_n (\varphi \circ p)(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{\pi} \varphi^{(|\pi|)}(p(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \prod_{B \in \pi} \partial_B p(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

where $\varphi^{(m)}$ denotes the m th derivative of φ , and the sum is over all set partitions π of $[n]$. Now, we fix some partition π and determine the sign of its term in the sum. By our assumption that $(-1)^m \varphi^{(m)} \leq 0$ and by the claim, its sign is

$$(-1)^{|\pi|+1} \prod_{B \in \pi} (-1)^{|B|+1} = (-1)^{|\pi|+1} (-1)^n (-1)^{|\pi|} = (-1)^{n+1}.$$

Hence

$$(-1)^n \partial_1 \cdots \partial_n (\varphi \circ p)(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 0$$

for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in [0, 1]$. This suffices to show that $\varphi \circ f$ is a pgf statistic, since

$$\Delta_{P_{\bullet}^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_{\bullet}^n} (\varphi \circ f)(\eta, S) = \Delta_1 \cdots \Delta_n (\varphi \circ p)(0, \dots, 0),$$

and a straightforward induction shows that

$$\Delta_1 \cdots \Delta_n (\varphi \circ p)(0, \dots, 0) = \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \partial_1 \cdots \partial_n (\varphi \circ p)(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n. \quad \square$$

Remark 16. Lemma 15 is not really a result about the frog model, though for simplicity we have stated it that way. Generally, suppose that \mathcal{X} is the space of point process configurations on some space S . For any $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $\chi \in \mathcal{X}$, and $x \in S$, define $\Delta_x f(\chi) = f(\chi + \delta_x) - f(\chi)$. Suppose that f satisfies the condition analogous to (8) for $m = 1, 2$, or that it satisfies it for $m \geq 1$. The proof of Lemma 15 shows that $\varphi \circ f$ satisfies these conditions too, with φ assumed to be increasing and concave in the first case and with a completely monotone derivative in the second case.

In the next lemma, we show that icv and pgf statistics are monotone in the distribution of frogs at a *single* vertex.

Lemma 17. *Make the assumptions of Theorem 1 on the distribution of frog paths $S_\bullet(v, i)$ and counts $\eta(v)$ and $\eta'(v)$. Also assume that η and η' have identical distributions at all but one vertex v_0 .*

- (a) *If f is an icv statistic and $\eta(v_0) \preceq_{icv} \eta'(v_0)$, then $f(\eta, S) \preceq_{icv} f(\eta', S)$.*
- (b) *If f is a pgf statistic and $\eta(v_0) \preceq_{pgf} \eta'(v_0)$, then $f(\eta, S) \preceq_{pgf} f(\eta', S)$.*

Proof. Define η_k to be the same as η except that $\eta_k(v_0) = k$. Let $W(k) = f(\eta_k, S)$. By our assumptions, $\eta(v_0)$ and $\eta'(v_0)$ are independent of $W(k)$, and hence

$$(12) \quad W(\eta(v_0)) \sim f(\eta, S) \quad \text{and} \quad W(\eta'(v_0)) \sim f(\eta', S).$$

We start with the proof of (a). Let $\varphi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an arbitrary bounded increasing concave function, and let $h(k) = \mathbf{E}\varphi(W(k))$ for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. As

$$\mathbf{E}h(\eta(v_0)) = \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta, S)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}h(\eta'(v_0)) = \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta', S))$$

by (12), our goal is to show that $\mathbf{E}h(\eta(v_0)) \leq \mathbf{E}h(\eta'(v_0))$. If we can show that $Dh(k) \geq 0$ and $D^2h(k) \leq 0$, then this follows immediately from Proposition 12(a) and the assumption that $\eta(v_0) \preceq_{icv} \eta'(v_0)$.

Unraveling all the definitions,

$$Dh(k) = \mathbf{E}[\varphi(f(\eta_{k+1}, S)) - \varphi(f(\eta_k, S))].$$

As $f(\eta_{k+1}, S) \geq f(\eta_k, S)$ and φ is increasing, one can see directly that $Dh(k) \geq 0$, but it is more instructive to derive this as a consequence of Lemma 15. Let P_\bullet be an independent copy of $S_\bullet(v_0, 1)$. By our assumption that $(S_\bullet(v_0, i))_{i \geq 1}$ are i.i.d. and independent of the other frog paths, the frog model (η_{k+1}, S) is distributed the same as $\sigma_{P_\bullet}(\eta_k, S)$. Hence

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} Dh(k) &= \mathbf{E}[\varphi(f(\sigma_{P_\bullet}(\eta_k, S))) - \varphi(f(\eta_k, S))] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\Delta_{P_\bullet}(\varphi \circ f)(\eta_k, S)], \end{aligned}$$

which is nonnegative since $\varphi \circ f$ is an icv statistic by Lemma 15(a). Similarly, if P_\bullet^1 and P_\bullet^2 are independent copies of $S_\bullet(v_0, i)$,

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} D^2h(k) &= \mathbf{E}[\varphi(f(\eta_{k+2}, S)) - 2\varphi(f(\eta_{k+1}, S)) + \varphi(f(\eta_k, S))] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\varphi(f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^1}\sigma_{P_\bullet^2}(\eta_k, S))) - \varphi(f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^1}(\eta_k, S))) - \varphi(f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^2}(\eta_k, S))) + \varphi(f(\eta_k, S))] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\Delta_{P_\bullet^1}\Delta_{P_\bullet^2}(\varphi \circ f)(\eta_k, S)] \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of part (a).

The proof of (b) is essentially the same. We take $\varphi(x) = 1 - t^x$ for arbitrary $t \in (0, 1)$ and define $h(k) = \mathbf{E}\varphi(W(k))$ as before. This time, we need to show that $(-1)^n D^n h(k) \leq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. By Proposition 12(b) and the assumption that $\eta(v_0) \preceq_{pgf} \eta'(v_0)$, it follows from this that $\mathbf{E}h(\eta(v_0)) \leq \mathbf{E}h(\eta'(v_0))$, and hence that $\mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta, S)) \leq \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta', S))$.

Let $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^n$ be independent copies of $S_\bullet(v_0, i)$. Using the notation of (6), for any $U \subseteq [n]$ with $|U| = i$, the frog model (η_{k+i}, S) is distributed identically to $\sigma_U(\eta_k, S)$. We

now generalize (13) and (14) by applying (3) and (7) to get

$$\begin{aligned} D^n h(k) &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^{n-i} \binom{n}{i} \varphi(f(\eta_{k+i}, S)) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^{n-i} \sum_{\substack{U \subseteq [n] \\ |U|=i}} \varphi(f(\sigma_U(\eta_k, S))) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E} [\Delta_{P^\bullet_1} \cdots \Delta_{P^\bullet_n} (\varphi \circ f)]. \end{aligned}$$

As $\varphi \circ f$ is a pgf statistic by Lemma 15(b), this shows that $(-1)^n D^n h(k) \leq 0$, completing the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. The basic idea is that Lemma 17 proves the result when η and η' have the same distribution at all but finitely many vertices, with the general case following from a limit argument relying on the continuity assumption. Recall from Definition 14 that we call a frog model statistic continuous if the upward convergence of frog counts implies the upward convergence of the statistic.

Let $G_1 \subseteq G_2 \subseteq \cdots$ be finite sets of vertices whose union is G . We use $\eta|_{G_k}$ and $\eta'|_{G_k}$ to denote restrictions to G_k . That is, $\eta|_{G_k}(v) = \eta(v) \mathbf{1}\{v \in G_k\}$. Since $\eta|_{G_k}$ and $\eta'|_{G_k}$ differ at only finitely many vertices, the repeated application of Lemma 17 proves that in case (a),

$$(15) \quad f(\eta|_{G_k}, S) \preceq_{\text{icv}} f(\eta'|_{G_k}, S),$$

and in case (b),

$$(16) \quad f(\eta|_{G_k}, S) \preceq_{\text{pgf}} f(\eta'|_{G_k}, S).$$

Now, we let φ be a test function and try to show that

$$(17) \quad \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta, S)) \leq \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta', S)).$$

For case (a), let $\varphi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a bounded increasing concave function. It suffices to show (17) for such functions φ , as any arbitrary bounded increasing concave function can be shifted to take nonnegative values. In case (b), let $\varphi(x) = 1 - t^x$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$. Interpreting $\varphi(\infty)$ as $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x)$ as usual, it holds by the continuity assumption that

$$\varphi(f(\eta|_{G_k}, S)) \nearrow \varphi(f(\eta, S)) \text{ a.s.} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(f(\eta'|_{G_k}, S)) \nearrow \varphi(f(\eta', S)) \text{ a.s.}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta|_{G_k}, S)) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta, S)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta'|_{G_k}, S)) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta', S))$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By (15) or (16), we have $\mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta|_{G_k}, S)) \leq \mathbf{E}\varphi(f(\eta'|_{G_k}, S))$, and this proves (17). \square

4. APPLICATIONS OF THE COMPARISON THEOREM

To apply Theorem 1, we first need to find some icv and pgf statistics. The following two lemmas highlight particular circumstances where we can draw conclusions about the difference operators applied to a statistic. For any frog model (η, S) and frog path P_\bullet , let $\kappa_{P_\bullet}(\eta, S)$ be the frog model with all frogs at vertex P_0 deleted and replaced by a single frog with path P_\bullet . Formally, if $\kappa_{P_\bullet}(\eta, S) = (\eta', S')$, then η' and S' are identical to η and S except that $\eta'(P_0) = 1$ and $S'_\bullet(P_0, 1) = P_\bullet$.

Lemma 18. *Let f be a frog model statistic taking values only in $\{0, 1\}$. Suppose that for some vertex v and all (η, S) ,*

$$(18) \quad f(\eta, S) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq \eta(v)} f(\kappa_{S_\bullet(v, i)}(\eta, S)).$$

Then for any paths $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^n$ originating at v ,

$$(-1)^n \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} f(\eta, S) \leq 0.$$

Proof. Fix some (η, S) and paths $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^n$ starting at v . Using the notation given in (6), if $f(\eta, S) = 1$, then $f(\sigma_U(\eta, S)) = 1$ for any $U \subseteq [n]$ by (18), and this makes

$$\Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} f(\eta, S) = 0,$$

and so the lemma holds in this case. If $f(\eta, S) = 0$, define $b_i = f(\sigma_{P_\bullet^i}(\eta, S))$. By (18), for any $U \subseteq [n]$,

$$f(\sigma_U(\eta, S)) = \max_{i \in U} b_i = 1 - \prod_{i \in U} (1 - b_i).$$

Applying (7),

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} f(\eta, S) &= \sum_{U \subseteq [n]} (-1)^{n-|U|} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in U} (1 - b_i) \right) \\ &= \sum_{U \subseteq [n]} (-1)^{n-|U|} - \sum_{U \subseteq [n]} (-1)^{n-|U|} \prod_{i \in U} (1 - b_i). \end{aligned}$$

The first sum is the expansion of $(1 - 1)^n$ and hence is zero. For the second sum,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{U \subseteq [n]} (-1)^{n-|U|} \prod_{i \in U} (1 - b_i) &= \prod_{i=1}^n ((1 - b_i) - 1) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (-b_i) = (-1)^n \mathbf{1}\{b_1 = \cdots = b_n = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} f(\eta, S) = (-1)^{n+1} \mathbf{1}\{b_1 = \cdots = b_n = 1\},$$

yielding $(-1)^n \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} f(\eta, S) \leq 0$. \square

Lemma 19. *Let f be a frog model statistic taking nonnegative values. Suppose that for some vertex v and all (η, S) ,*

$$(19) \quad f(\eta, S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\eta(v)} f(\kappa_{S_\bullet(v, i)}(\eta, S)).$$

Then for any paths $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^n$ originating at v ,

$$(-1)^n \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} f(\eta, S) \leq 0.$$

Proof. Fix (η, S) and paths $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^n$ originating at v . Let $b_i = f(\kappa_{P_\bullet^i}(\eta, S))$, and let $b = f(\eta, S)$. As in the previous lemma, we use the notation σ_U given in (6). From (19), for any $U \subseteq [n]$,

$$f(\sigma_U(\eta, S)) = b + \sum_{i \in U} b_i.$$

The operator D_a defined in (9) satisfies

$$D_{a_1} \cdots D_{a_n} h(x) = \sum_{U \subseteq [n]} (-1)^{n-|U|} h\left(x + \sum_{i \in U} a_i\right),$$

proven identically as (3) and (7). Comparing with (7), we have

$$\Delta_{P_1^\bullet} \cdots \Delta_{P_n^\bullet} f(\eta, S) = D_{b_1} \cdots D_{b_n} \text{id}(b),$$

where $\text{id}(x) = x$. For $n \geq 2$ this is equal to zero, as follows from the second and higher partial derivatives of id being zero. For $n = 1$, this is nonnegative, because $b_1 \geq 0$ by our assumption that f takes nonnegative values. \square

Now, we apply Lemmas 18 and 19 to prove that various frog model statistics are pgf (and hence also icv). We start with some counts of visited sites.

Proposition 20. *For $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and any nonroot vertex u , let $a_{t,u}(\eta, S)$ be an indicator on site u being visited in the frog model (η, S) by time t . Let $a_t(\eta, S)$ be the total number of sites visited by time t . Then both $a_{t,u}$ and a_t are continuous icv and pgf statistics.*

Proof. First, we show that $a_{t,u}$ is a pgf statistic. Let $v \neq u$ be a nonroot vertex. We claim that (18) is satisfied for $a_{t,u}$ and vertex v . To prove this, we need to show that $a_{t,u}(\eta, S) = 1$ if and only if $a_{t,u}(\kappa_{S_\bullet(v,i)}(\eta, S)) = 1$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \eta(v)$. First, suppose $a_{t,u}(\eta, S) = 1$. This means that there exists a sequence of frogs starting with the initial frog and ending with a frog that visits u such that each frog activates the next one in the sequence and the combined path length is at most t . If this sequence includes the i th frog at v , then $a_{t,u}(\kappa_{S_\bullet(v,i)}(\eta, S)) = 1$. If the sequence does not include any of the frogs originating at v , then $a_{t,u}(\kappa_{S_\bullet(v,i)}(\eta, S)) = 1$ for any $1 \leq i \leq \eta(v)$. The converse is obvious, since if u is visited in time t by $\kappa_{S_\bullet(v,i)}(\eta, S)$ then it is also visited by (η, S) , as (η, S) has all the frogs of $\kappa_{S_\bullet(v,i)}(\eta, S)$ and more. Thus, Lemma 18 applies and shows that

$$(-1)^n \Delta_{P_1^\bullet} \cdots \Delta_{P_n^\bullet} a_{t,u}(\eta, S) \leq 0$$

for any (η, S) , nonroot vertices $u \neq v$, and paths $P_1^\bullet, \dots, P_n^\bullet$ originating at v . In the case $u = v$,

$$(-1)^n \Delta_{P_1^\bullet} \cdots \Delta_{P_n^\bullet} a_{t,u}(\eta, S) = 0,$$

as the addition of extra frogs at u does not affect whether u is visited. Thus, $a_{t,u}$ is a pgf statistic for any nonroot vertex u .

Now, we express a_t as

$$(20) \quad a_t(\eta, S) = \sum_{v \neq \emptyset} a_{t,v}(\eta, S).$$

By the linearity of the difference operator, any sum of pgf statistics is a pgf statistic, and hence a_t is a pgf statistic.

It remains to prove that $a_{u,t}$ and a_t are continuous. This holds because any frog woken in (η, S) relies only on a finite sequence of frogs to wake it. More formally, suppose that the components of η_k converge upwards to η as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If $a_{t,u}(\eta, S) = 1$, then for large enough k we have $a_{t,v}(\eta_k, S) = 1$, because the sequence of frogs visiting u in time t is finite. Thus $a_{t,u}(\eta_k, S) \nearrow a_{t,u}(\eta, S)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, meaning that $a_{t,u}$ is continuous. By (20) and monotone convergence, $a_t(\eta_k, S) \nearrow a_t(\eta, S)$, and a_t is continuous as well. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. This is a slightly more complicated version of the previous proof. For any nonroot vertex u , let $r_u(\eta, S)$ be the number of visits to the root in the frog model (η, S) by frogs originating at vertex u . Fix some vertex $v \neq u$ and frog paths $P_\bullet^1, \dots, P_\bullet^n$ originating at v , and fix (η, S) . Let N be the total number of visits to the root by paths $S_\bullet(u, 1), \dots, S_\bullet(u, \eta(u))$. Since adding extra frogs at vertex v affects only whether u is activated, not the number of frogs returning from it if activated,

$$r_u(\sigma_U(\eta, S)) = N a_{\infty, u}(\sigma_U(\eta, S))$$

for any $U \subseteq [n]$. It then follows from Proposition 20 that $(-1)^n \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} r_u(\eta, S) \leq 0$.

Next, we consider the case $v = u$. If u is visited by (η, S) , then the number of visits to the root originating at u is the number of visits to the root by paths $S_\bullet(u, 1), \dots, S_\bullet(u, \eta(u))$. Since modifying the frogs at u does not change whether u is visited, this implies that if $a_{\infty, u}(\eta, S) = 1$,

$$r_u(\eta, S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\eta(u)} r_u(\kappa_{S_\bullet(u, i)}(\eta, S)).$$

This equation also holds if $a_{\infty, u}(\eta, S) = 0$, since then both sides are zero. Hence the conditions of Lemma 19 are satisfied, and $(-1)^n \Delta_{P_\bullet^1} \cdots \Delta_{P_\bullet^n} r_u(\eta, S) \leq 0$. This shows that r_u is a pgf statistic. By writing r as a sum of r_u over $u \in G$, we see that r is also a pgf statistic, and by the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 20, this statistic is continuous. \square

Proofs of Corollaries 3 and 5. We apply Theorem 1, Proposition 2, and Proposition 13(a), along with the observation made in Section 2 that $\mathbf{P}[X = \infty] \leq \mathbf{P}[Y = \infty]$ if $X \preceq_{\text{icv}} Y$. \square

Proof of Corollary 4. The transience part of this result is a consequence of [HJJ16a, Proposition 15]. The recurrence part follows from Corollary 3, [HJJ16a, Theorem 1], and [JJ16, Theorem 1]. \square

Proof of Corollary 6. This is proven the same as Corollaries 3 and 5, except that Proposition 13(b) is used instead of Proposition 13(a). \square

Proof of Corollary 7. For $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $T(v)$ and $T'(v)$ be the time that the vertex v is activated for the frog models with η and η' frogs per site, respectively. Let $a_{t,v} = \mathbf{1}\{T(v) \leq t\}$ be an indicator that v has been activated by time t , and similarly for $a'_{t,v}$. By Proposition 20, $a_{t,v}$ and $a'_{t,v}$ are continuous icv and pgf statistics. Moreover, we can express $T(v)$ and $T'(v)$ in terms of these statistics:


$$T(v) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (1 - a_{t,v}), \quad T'(v) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (1 - a'_{t,v}).$$

By Theorem 1, we have $a_{t,v} \preceq_{\text{icv}} a'_{t,v}$, and hence $\mathbf{E}a_{t,v} \leq \mathbf{E}a'_{t,v}$. Apply this, along with Fubini's theorem, to the expressions for $T(v)$ and $T'(v)$ to obtain

$$(21) \quad \mathbf{E}T'(v) \leq \mathbf{E}T(v).$$

As in the proof of [AMPR01, Theorem 1.1], the limiting shapes are determined by functions μ and μ' with domain \mathbb{R}^d . The function μ is obtained via Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem by defining

$$(22) \quad \mu(v) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(nv)}{n} = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{E}T(nv)}{n},$$

FIGURE 1. A graph used to define the operator \mathcal{A} in [HJJ16b].

where $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. After interpolating to all of \mathbb{R}^d , the limiting shape is given by $\mathcal{A} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mu(x) \leq 1\}$. The set \mathcal{A}' is obtained in the same fashion. To deduce that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}'$, it then suffices to show that $\mu'(v) \leq \mu(v)$ for $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This follows from (21) applied to the expected value formulation of μ at (22). \square

Proof of Corollary 8. This also has the same proof as Corollaries 3, 4, and 5, except that Proposition 20 replaces Proposition 2. \square

Remark 21. As we mentioned in the introduction, one of the motivations for part (b) of Theorem 1 is that [HJJ16b, Lemma 10] and similar results are direct corollaries of it. Besides providing a satisfying explanation of why Lemma 10 holds, this is potentially useful in deriving other recurrence results.

Here, we describe Lemma 10 in more detail and explain why it follows from Theorem 1(b). The lemma is a monotonicity result for an operator \mathcal{A} acting on probability distributions on the nonnegative integers. (In [HJJ16b], the operator is described as acting on probability generating functions, but this comes to the same thing.) The operator can be defined as follows. Let π be a probability distribution on the nonnegative integers. Consider a binary tree truncated to four vertices as in Figure 1. Place one frog on \emptyset and one frog on \emptyset' , and independently sample from π to decide the number of frogs on u and v . The frog paths are random nonbacktracking walks stopped when a frog reaches a leaf. Now, run the frog model starting with the frog at \emptyset active until all frogs are stopped. Define $\mathcal{A}\pi$ to be the distribution of frogs terminating at \emptyset . In [HJJ16b], the operator was defined in a different way, but it turns out to be equivalent. See also [HJJ16a, Section 2.2] and [JJ16, Section 3.1.2] for similar constructions.

The result of Lemma 10 is that $\pi \preceq_{\text{pgf}} \pi'$ implies that $\mathcal{A}\pi \preceq_{\text{pgf}} \mathcal{A}\pi'$. As $\mathcal{A}\pi$ is the distribution of visits to \emptyset in the frog model on the truncated graph, it is a continuous pgf statistic by Proposition 2. Thus the lemma is a consequence of Theorem 1(b).

REFERENCES

- [Akh65] N. I. Akhiezer, *The classical moment problem and some related questions in analysis*, translated by N. Kemmer, Hafner Publishing Co., New York, 1965. MR 0184042
- [AMP02a] O. S. M. Alves, F. P. Machado, and S. Yu. Popov, *The shape theorem for the frog model*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **12** (2002), no. 2, 533–546. MR 1910638 (2003c:60159)
- [AMP02b] Oswaldo Alves, Fabio Machado, and Serguei Popov, *Phase transition for the frog model*, Electron. J. Probab. **7** (2002), no. 16, 1–21.
- [AMPR01] O. S. M. Alves, F. P. Machado, S. Yu. Popov, and K. Ravishankar, *The shape theorem for the frog model with random initial configuration*, Markov Process. Related Fields **7** (2001), no. 4, 525–539. MR 1893139 (2003f:60171)
- [DP14] Christian Döbler and Lorenz Pfeifroth, *Recurrence for the frog model with drift on \mathbb{Z}^d* , Electron. Commun. Probab. **19** (2014), no. 79, 13. MR 3283610

- [FMS04] L. R. Fontes, F. P. Machado, and A. Sarkar, *The critical probability for the frog model is not a monotonic function of the graph*, J. Appl. Probab. **41** (2004), no. 1, 292–298. MR 2036292 (2004m:60221)
- [GS09] Nina Gantert and Philipp Schmidt, *Recurrence for the frog model with drift on \mathbb{Z}* , Markov Process. Related Fields **15** (2009), no. 1, 51–58. MR 2509423 (2010g:60170)
- [Har06] Michael Hardy, *Combinatorics of partial derivatives*, Electron. J. Combin. **13** (2006), no. 1, Research Paper 1, 13 pp. (electronic). MR 2200529
- [HJJ16a] Christopher Hoffman, Tobias Johnson, and Matthew Junge, *From transience to recurrence with Poisson tree frogs*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **26** (2016), no. 3, 1620–1635.
- [HJJ16b] ———, *Recurrence and transience for the frog model on trees*, to appear in the *Annals of Probability*, available at arXiv:1404.6238, 2016.
- [JJ16] Tobias Johnson and Matthew Junge, *The critical density for the frog model is the degree of the tree*, available at arXiv:1607.07914, 2016.
- [KZ16] Elena Kosygina and Martin P. W. Zerner, *A zero-one law for recurrence and transience of frog processes*, to appear in *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, available at arXiv:1508.01953, 2016.
- [LMP05] Élcio Lebensztayn, Fábio P. Machado, and Serguei Popov, *An improved upper bound for the critical probability of the frog model on homogeneous trees*, J. Stat. Phys. **119** (2005), no. 1-2, 331–345. MR 2144514 (2006b:82068)
- [LT14] Junghoon Lee and Cihan Tepedelenlioğlu, *Stochastic ordering of interference in large-scale wireless networks*, IEEE Trans. Signal Process. **62** (2014), no. 3, 729–740. MR 3160309
- [Mar02] R. Marchand, *Strict inequalities for the time constant in first passage percolation*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **12** (2002), no. 3, 1001–1038. MR 1925450
- [Pop01] Serguei Yu. Popov, *Frogs in random environment*, J. Statist. Phys. **102** (2001), no. 1-2, 191–201. MR 1819703 (2002a:82064)
- [RS04] Alejandro F. Ramírez and Vladas Sidoravicius, *Asymptotic behavior of a stochastic combustion growth process*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **6** (2004), no. 3, 293–334. MR 2060478 (2005e:60234)
- [SS07] Moshe Shaked and J. George Shanthikumar, *Stochastic orders*, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York, 2007. MR 2265633 (2008g:60005)
- [Sta12] Richard P. Stanley, *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1*, second ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 49, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. MR 2868112
- [TRZ11] Cihan Tepedelenlioğlu, Adithya Rajan, and Yuan Zhang, *Applications of stochastic ordering to wireless communications*, no. 12, 4249–4257.
- [TW99] András Telcs and Nicholas C. Wormald, *Branching and tree indexed random walks on fractals*, J. Appl. Probab. **36** (1999), no. 4, 999–1011. MR 1742145 (2001m:60199)
- [vdBK93] J. van den Berg and H. Kesten, *Inequalities for the time constant in first-passage percolation*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **3** (1993), no. 1, 56–80. MR 1202515
- [Zer98] Martin P. W. Zerner, *Directional decay of the Green's function for a random nonnegative potential on \mathbb{Z}^d* , Ann. Appl. Probab. **8** (1998), no. 1, 246–280. MR 1620370

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
E-mail address: tobias.johnson@nyu.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DUKE UNIVERSITY
E-mail address: jungem@math.duke.edu